THE DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTY SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN OHIO FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR 1946-1947

A Thesis Presented for the
Degree of Master of Arts

By

Richard H. Hackenbracht, B. Sc. in Ed.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

1947

Approved by:

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the aid given me in the preparation of this manuscript.

To my adviser, Dr. E. E. Lewis, who read the manuscript and made many helpful suggestions for its improvement.

To Mr. R. M. Eyman, Assistant State Superintendent of Instruction, who granted me permission to obtain the statistics upon which this study is based, from various reports on file at the State Department of Education.

To my wife, Margaret, for typing and proof-reading the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

THE DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTY SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN OHIO FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR 1946-1947

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The public secondary school has become a very definite part of public education. Its mushroom growth has placed secondary schools not only in the populous centers of Ohio, but also in the rural areas of the state. With the rapid growth in the number of public secondary schools, many problems have become apparent.

One of Ohio's most pressing educational problems has been and still is the small rural secondary schools, which are located in her eighty-eight counties. That the small rural secondary school is a problem has been recognized by educators. They have shown that the small rural secondary schools are inefficient, uneconomical, and do not offer the educational opportunities that are offered in large rural, exempted village, and city schools.

When the impact of the depression was felt during the 1930's, economies were effected which forced the schools to seek financial aid from the State of Ohio. In answering the cry for financial assistance, the Traxler-Kieffer-

Mathews Foundation Program was enacted into law. This law provided the method by which state funds were to be distributed to the public schools of Ohio.

The Ohio Legislature was cognizant of the defects of the small rural secondary school and incorporated the Metzenbaum amendment, under the Traxler-Kieffer-Mathews law. This provided for the reorganization of rural school districts, in order that they would become more efficient, economical, and provide better educational opportunities for students of the rural districts.

Within the Ohio School Code, adopted in 1943, the plan of reorganization is expressed by Section 4831. It provides:

> On or before the first Monday in March in the year 1944 and on or before the first Monday in March in every even numbered year thereafter, each county board of education shall by a majority vote of its full membership, adopt a plan of territorial organization of the school districts under its supervision. Such plan of organization shall prescribe such transfers of territory, elimination of local school districts, and creation of new school districts which, in the opinion of the county board of education, will provide a more economical or efficient county school system.[1]

Problem

In view of the fact that the above reorganization

---

[1]Baldwin's Ohio School Laws, 1943.

plan has been in effect since the adoption of the Traxler-Kieffer-Mathews Foundation Program in 1935, the question immediately arises whether the reorganization plan has had any effect upon the distribution of county rural secondary schools.

The problem of this study shall be to show the distribution of rural secondary schools in Ohio for the school year 1946-1947. The results of this study will be compared with those obtained in a similar study made by John A. Hickman in 1935.[2] The comparison will show changes which have occurred in the distribution of rural secondary schools during the past twelve years.

Purpose of the Study

It has been popular to condemn the numerous rural secondary schools. In retrospect, it is difficult to see why so many secondary schools were established in our rural districts. But one must remember that many of these schools were established before an efficient means of transportation was possible; that is, before a system of roads had become established.

Rather than condemning our forefathers for the number

---

[2]John A. Hickman, Recent Changes in the Distribution of High Schools in the County Districts of Ohio. Unpublished Master's thesis, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1935.

of rural schools they established, it should be our duty to ascertain the status of the rural secondary schools as they are today, and to plan their future development. It is hoped that this study will contribute in some way to the general understanding of the needs of rural secondary schools and to the ultimate solution of the needs.

Delimitation of the Problem

Although the temptation may be great, this study will not concern itself with a discussion of any deficiencies which may exist in the distribution of rural secondary schools. Neither will there be a discussion of possible remedies for any existing deficiencies. These problems and their treatment will be left to other investigator.

Similar Studies

Two prior studies have been made upon the general subject of distribution of secondary schools in Ohio. The first study was made by Otis C. Hatton[3] in 1927; the second study was made by Hickman[4] in 1935. Because of the changes in distribution which Hickman found in comparing his re-

---

[3]Otis C. Hatton, The Distribution of High Schools in the County Districts of Ohio. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1927.

[4]John A. Hickman, op. cit.

sults with those obtained by Hatton, this writer feels that a comparison of the results of his study with those obtained by Hickman will bring to light further changes in the distribution of county secondary schools.

Sources of Data

The statistics from which the tables were constructed were obtained from the Ohio Educational Directories, 1934-1935 and 1946-1947; and the Principal's Reports to the State Department of Education for the school year 1946-1947.

Tables showing various results of Hickman's study will be used with columns of present statistics added in order to show comparisons between the results. Several tables will be used which are the same as those used by Hatton[5] and later by Hickman[6], but with wholly new statistics.

---

[5]Otis C. Hatton, op. cit.
[6]John A. Hickman, op. cit.

CHAPTER II

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATION IN OHIO

The development of public education in Ohio had its beginning before the birth of the State of Ohio; indeed, even before the formation of the present United States Government. When Colonel Timothy Pickering made proposals for the settlement of the new state (Ohio) in the western domain, one proposal stated:

> These rights being secured, all surplus lands shall be the common property of the state, and be disposed of for the common good; as for laying out roads, building bridges, creating public buildings, establishing schools and academies, defraying the expenses of government, and other public uses.[1]

The Pickering proposal, with regard to establishing schools, was adopted in the Land Ordinance of 1785. This famous Ordinance stated:

> There shall be reserved the Lot No. 16, of every township, for the maintenance of public schools within the said township; also one-third part of all gold, silver, lead and copper mines, to be sold, or otherwise disposed of as Congress shall hereafter direct ....[2]

---

[1]The quotation is from Arthur B. Moehlman's, School Administration, p. 810. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940.

[2]Henry Steele Commager, Editor. Documents of American History, p. 124. New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1943.

That the inclusion of means for supporting public schools in the Land Ordinance of 1785 was probably actuated by an interest in stimulating land sales cannot be denied. That it also was important in stimulating a desire for education be denied. Samuel Lewis, first State Superintendent of Schools for Ohio, related that more than once, when a boy, he heard the friends of his resolute mother attempt to dissuade her from emigration to the West. Her reply which she considered as a sufficient reason was, "My children will there be entitled to education as well as the rich".[3]

The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 laid down the general principles for the government of the territory, but was never implemented. However, Article 3 of this ordinance contains a famous pronouncement on education which is still incorporated in the Ohio Constitution.

> Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged.[4]

When Ohio, the first state carved from the Northwest Territory, was admitted to the Union, the provisions for school lands, contained in the Land Ordinance of 1785,

---

[1]J. J. Burns, Educational History of Ohio, p. 23. Columbus, Ohio: Historical Publishing Company, 1905.
[2]Henry Steele Commager, op. cit., p. 131.

were granted and vested the control of school lands in the state legislature.

While common schools grew in Ohio from the beginning, the establishment of public secondary schools were much slower. The academy, introduced from Eastern States, partially filled the position of the modern secondary school. During the first half of the nineteenth century, this type of educational institution flourished, furnishing an opportunity to receive a higher education which the public schools did not provide. Additional academies were founded during the last half of the nineteenth century and, in fact, some remain in operation to this day. The academy was formed by private companies or religous denominations and were incorporated by permission obtained from the state legislature. Academies were supported wholly or partly by tuition, which prohibited many students from attending them.

By 1850, public secondary schools had been established in Cincinnati (1845) and Columbus (1850). The idea of public high schools proved attractive and successful. When J. J. Burns took the office of Commissioner of Education in 1877, the desire for high schools was at high tide. In the year 1877, Mr. Burns asked the Attorney General for an opinion on whether boards of

education could, under law, establish high schools and support same by general taxation.

Attorney General Pillar's reply stated the opinion:

> I conclude, therefore, after a full investigation of the question, that a board of education is authorized, by the letter, true spirit, and meaning of the law enacted in obedience to the requirement of Section 2, Article 6, of the Constitution (1851), to establish such schools, with such grades, and with such courses of instruction in the various departments of education as, in its wisdom, the public good may seem to require.[5]

Before too much significance is attached to this opinion, and the effect it had on the development of high schools in Ohio, it must be remembered that this opinion was rendered after the decision of the Michigan Supreme Court on the Kalamazoo Case of 1872. Chief Justice Thomas M. Cooley wrote the decision of the Michigan Court.

> ....We content ourselves with the statement that neither in our state policy, in our constitution, nor in our laws, do we find the primary school districts restricted in the branches of knowledge which their officers may cause to be taught, or the grade of instruction that may be given, if their voters consent in regular form to bear the expense and raise the taxes for the purpose....[6]

Progress was made in the expansion of public high schools in the more populous centers of Ohio, but little

---

[5]J. J. Burns, op. cit., p. 180

[6]This quotation is from Ward G. Reeder's, A First Course in Education, pp. 36-37. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937.

progress had been made in bringing secondary education to the rural population, until the passage of the Boxwell law in 1892. This law provided for an examination to be given to students who were completing their elementary education and further provided:

> The tuition of such successful applicant shall be paid by the board of education of the township or the special district in which such applicant resides, provided that there is no high school maintained and supported by the township or special district in which such pupil resides, where such pupil may attend without paying tuition.[7]

J. J. Burns, in discussing the slow growth of public education during the nineteenth century, points out the following reasons:

1. Persons who take for specimens of Ohio certain positions settled by families from States where the doctrine of the public school was part of the common school creed err greatly. The members of the convention that framed the first constitution of Ohio came from the East. Many of them were from states which did not believe in free schools, while those from New England were not in the majority.

2. The constant demands of their environment....

3. The promise, never realized, of munificent and effective aid, from the general government; possibly even the actual aid itself, was, in the long stride of the years, a clog.... The promise taught the people to look to the state rather than to themselves.

---

[7]Ohio School Laws, 1900, Section 4029-1.

The "actual aid" made it possible to maintain during a long intermediate period, some poor copy of a school for a miserably short time each year; which "poor excuse helped to quiet the call of conscience for something better of those who knew that there was something better.

4. The idea was still dominant that a scheme of education necessarily contemplated a fostering by governments of great institutions of higher learning and letting some sort of blind gravity cause a little to find its way down to the common folk.

5. Great as was the influence for good of the church schools and the private schools, it need not be asserted that their striving to possess the land was primarily to educate the people; or denied, that the large numbers of cultured people interested, financially, and otherwise in these institutions, could look with an abundant lack of interest upon efforts toward the organization of a system whose success would restrict their field of operation.

6. This, perhaps, is made up of all the rest - the reluctant harboring in the minds of the large tax payers of a strange communistic doctrine - "the property of the State should educate the children of the State", or with narrower boundaries, not so swelling a blast of oratory but much more truth, "the property of a district should educate the children of a district".

7. It may have been wise, it may have been necessary, to introduce nearly every forward measure with a "by your leave", but it served as a brake....

8. The most potent powers in the camp of the opposition have been under the command of general apathy.[8]

The development of rural secondary schools received their largest impetus for growth during the twentieth

---

[8]J. J. Burns, op. cit., pp. 301-302.

century. The growth was not a steady, smooth growth; but more of an irregular advance to its present position.

Legislative action was first permissive when the Legislature granted permission for adjoining townships to unite for high school purposes. This action could be taken by a majority vote of the combined boards of education.[9]

Action to make the rural school system more effective was taken in 1914 with the creation of the county district, which enveloped all rural public schools. The county district was administrated by a county board of education and a county superintendent of schools.[10]

At first, the county board of education was given very broad powers. It had unqualified authority to arrange the schools according to topgraphy and population in order that they might be more easily accessible to pupils. No longer were township lines regarded as sacred in the reorganization of school districts. They could be disregarded if it best suited the purpose of school efficiency.

The Legislature further granted the county board of education authority to "by resolution at any regular or

---

[9]Ohio School Laws, 1906, Section 3894.
[10]Ohio School Laws, 1915, Section 4679.

special meeting to change school district lines and transfer territory from one rural or village school district to another". This arbitrary power was short lived and was modified by the Legislature the following year. The county board was then required to file notice with the local district boards concerned, of proposed changes and if no protest was filed within thirty days, the action of the county board became effective. Once again the authority to form efficient school districts was left to the local districts and weak districts were again perpetuated.

Nevertheless, secondary schools continued to grow in number. Vocational education was introduced by the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917, and made rural secondary education much more popular.

Confidence in the existing school system was expressed by Frank P. Pearson, at the time when he was Superintendent of Public Institution in 1917:

> In nearly all counties, marked improvement has been noted as follows: a uniform course of study and uniform text books have been adopted, the enrollment and average daily attendance has been increased, buildings have been repaired and equipment has been added. Physical conditions in general have been improved, community interests have been awakened, and a better school sentiment has resulted. Professional standards

> are higher and there is more efficient teaching.[11]

Beginning in the 1920's, the next great development in education was a strengthening of the State Department of Education in relation to the school system. This was hastened by the financial troubles of school districts.

In 1906, the passage of the Duvall law set up a plan of state aid to weak districts. Geer[12] shows that the amount paid to weak school districts had risen from $2,647.00 in 1908 to $611,227.00 in 1920, when it had only come to amount to four percent of the total expenditure for public schools.

During the period 1920 to 1930, state aid had increased to $3,850,424.00. In 1930, approximately one-third of all school districts were receiving state aid. It will be noticed that this trend had been accelerated during a decade of prosperity.

The financial situation was dealt two blows shortly after the beginning of the 1930's. An economic depression was spreading over the nation, and Ohio by an amendment to the State Constitution, passed a ten-mill tax limitation

---

[11] Quoted from Ralph H. Geer's, History of Education 1900 to 1938, p. 82. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1938.

[12] Ibid., p. 46 (table VII).

upon real estate.

Increased demands were made on the Legislature to give financial aid to local school districts. State financial aid was finally furnished by the passage of the Traxler-Kieffer-Matthews Foundation Program[13] in 1935. In general, the Foundation Program accomplished two things. First, funds were distributed to all school districts, regardless of need, on the basis of average daily attendance. Second, additional funds were granted to those districts, which after meeting certain standards, still could not meet minimum operating costs as defined by law, so they could meet the minimum cost.

Before the Foundation Law was passed, it was joined by the Metzenbaum amendment.[14] The Metzenbaum amendment required the county board of education to annually form a plan for reorganizing the county school districts. A meeting of all board members within the county was then called to discuss the proposed plan. After a plan was adopted, it was filed with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, before the first day in July in each year. The Superintendent of Public Instruction, after holding hearings, could modify the plans. The Metzenbaum

---

[13]Ohio School Laws, 1935, Sections 7595--7595-1h.
[14]Ohio School Laws, 1935, Sections 7600-1.

amendment enpowered the Superintendent of Public Instruction with authority to act if the boards failed to act or failed to agree.

It might be pointed out that the Metzenbaum amendment was aimed at those weak or small school districts which had never been able to meet their financial obligations. As such, it was also aimed at those small rural high schools which continued to exist by the grace of state financial aid.

The essentials of the Foundation Program has continued to the present time. Some modifications have been made in the Metzenbaum Amendment, such as, (a) plan of reorganization is submitted biennially and, (b) providing the population of a proposed transferred district a chance to reject the proposed reorganization plan.[15]

By the Legislature's action in granting financial support to the local districts and other laws, a measure of control has shifted from the local districts to the State Department of Education. This control has manifested itself chiefly in (1) the matter of the size and number of districts, (2) in strengthening the function

---

[15]Ohio School Laws, 1943, Sections 4831.

of the county board of education and the county superintendent, and (3) in the financial dependence of districts on the state.

CHAPTER III

STATUS OF SECONDARY EDUCATION IN OHIO FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR 1946-1947

School districts in Ohio are classified for supervision into three types.

1. City Districts

   A city district is one in which, at the last federal census, had a population of five thousand or more.[1]

2. Exempted Village Districts

   An exempted village school district is one in which, at the last federal census, had a population of three thousand within the corporate limits of the village.

   If a village contains a population of two thousand and is joined by territory having a population of one thousand, it becomes eligible to be styled an exempted village district.

   In either case, the board of education must vote to become exempt from county supervision.[2]

3. County districts

   County districts include that territory of a county, exclusive of the territory embraced in any city or exempted village school districts, and excluding the territory detached therefrom for school purposes shall constitute a county school district.[3]

---

[1]Baldwin's Ohio School Laws, 1943, Section 4830-1.
[2]Ibid., Section 4830-7.
[3]Ibid., Section 4830-4.

Ohio, for the school year of 1946-1947, contained 1242 secondary schools. This, compared with the 1305 secondary schools existing in 1935, is a decrease of sixty-three, or 5.1 percent. Of the total number of secondary schools existing in 1947, 285 are located in city districts, 88 in exempted village districts, and 869 in county school districts. From 1935 to 1947, both city and county districts show a decrease of seven and eighty-five, respectively; while secondary schools in exempted village districts show an increase of 29. Table 1 shows these changes.

TABLE 1. NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS LOCATED IN CITY, EXEMPTED VILLAGE, AND COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

	NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS			
Location of Secondary School	1935[a]	1947[b]	Increase or Decrease	
In Cities	292	285		-7
In Exempted Villages	59	88	plus	29
In County Districts	954	869		-85
Total Secondary School	1305	1242	Decreased	63

[a]Data obtained from John A. Hickman's, Recent Changes in the Distribution of High Schools in the County Districts of Ohio.

[b]Data obtained from Ohio Educational Directory, 1946-1947.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction is charged with the duty of classifying and chartering the secondary

schools. This classification involves both grade and type. According to grade, a school is classified as first, second, and third, depending upon the number of years of work offered.

1. The first grade high school includes:
    a. Six-year secondary schools, including grades 7-12 inclusively.
    b. Four-year secondary schools, including grades 9-12 inclusively.
2. The second grade includes secondary schools, offering grades 9-11 inclusively.
3. The third grade includes secondary schools, offering grades 9-10 inclusively.
4. Some secondary schools are classified as to type. They are:
    a. Junior high schools, including grades 7-9 inclusively.
    b. Senior high schools, including grades 10-12 inclusively.

Secondary schools are also chartered according to their grade. Thus, a school of the first grade is granted a first grade charter as either a six-year or four-year secondary school. However, Principals, in their reports to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, many times report that while they are chartered as a four-year secondary school, their functional organization is that of a six-year secondary school. The State Department of Education in the Educational Directory for the school

year of 1946-1947, computes the number of teachers and enrollment according to the chartered organization. Because of this, tables showing secondary schools according to their classification, will be compiled on the basis of their chartered organization.

From Table 2, we find that the six-year secondary school is the most numerous type in Ohio. Of the 849 first grade secondary schools, 505 are chartered as six-year and 344 as four-year. It will be noticed that this is a reversal of the positions held in 1935. Actually, 698 function as six-year secondary schools and only 151 as four-year.

The decline of the second and third grade secondary schools from 1935 to 1947 is very pronounced. The number of second grade schools has shrunk from forty-eight in 1935 to two; while third grade schools have declined from twenty-four in 1935 to one. In light of such a decrease in the number of second and third grade secondary schools, it is not too presumptuous to forecast their ultimate extinction.

One senior high school is maintained in 1947 where none existed in 1935. The junior high school also showed a gain from twelve in 1935 to sixteen in 1947.

Table 2 also demonstrates a tendency toward larger

secondary schools with the decrease in the number of schools in county districts from 954 in 1935 to 869 in 1947, or 9.8 percent. Several reasons may be cited as being responsible for this decrease, with probably no single reason being the sole one responsible for the abandonment of any single school; rather a combination of reasons are responsible. Some of the reasons are:

1. The reorganization of school districts which enables the territory served by a high school to be enlarged, thereby consolidating areas having two high schools into one area with one secondary school.

2. Transportation facilities have been improved, enabling a larger area to be served by a single high school.

3. The economic depression which prevailed during the last decade undoubtedly caused the consolidation of small high schools into one high school.

4. Teacher shortage caused by the war when teachers entered the armed services and war production factories.

5. The building program, partially financed by the Works Progress Administration, enabled construction of new buildings or additions to prevailing buildings, which in turn, accommodated more students.

6. An active campaign, by school administrators and educators, pointing out that the small secondary school is uneconomical, inefficient, and unable to offer the educational opportunities that are offered by the larger secondary schools.

7. Demand by parents and students for schools to

offer more opportunities than the small secondary schools were physically or financially able to support.

TABLE 2. SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE COUNTY DISTRICTS CLASSIFIED AS TO TYPES

Type of Secondary School	NUMBER	
	1935[a]	1947[b]
First Grade Six Year	358	698
Four Year	512	151
Second Grade	48	2
Third Grade	24	1
Senior	0	1
Junior	12	16
Total	964	869

[a]Data obtained from John A. Hickman's, Recent Changes in the Distribution of High Schools in the County Districts of Ohio.

[b]Data obtained from Ohio Educational Directory, 1946-1947 and Principal's Reports to the State Department of Education.

As the number of secondary schools in Ohio has decreased, so has the enrollment. The decrease has been from 442,891 in 1935 to 397,695 in 1947, or 11.3 percent. However, only city districts decreased; from 295,201 in 1935 to 241,313 in 1947. Exempted village high schools showed the greatest increase, while in county districts, secondary schools made a slight increase from 125,790 in 1935 to 126,383 in 1947. Table 3 shows these changes.

Both city and exempted village secondary schools show a decrease of average enrollment. This was to be

expected of the city districts, since they had decreased, both in number of secondary schools and in enrollment. Exempted village districts show a decrease from 371 in 1935 to 341 in 1947..for the average enrollment of their secondary schools. Evidently, although the total enrollment increased, the increase in the number of secondary schools was relatively greater, bring down the average enrollment of exempted village secondary schools.

Table 3 finds the average enrollment of county district high schools making an increase from 132 in 1935 to 145 in 1947, or 8.9 per cent. When we notice the slight increase in enrollment, we can attribute this increase, almost entirely, to the decrease in the number of secondary schools in the county districts.

TABLE 3. SIZE OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN DISTRICTS, BY ENROLLMENT

DISTRICTS	ENROLLMENT			
	1935[a]		1947[b]	
	TOTAL	ARITHMETIC MEAN	TOTAL	ARITHMETIC MEAN
City	295,201	1,011	241,313	847
Exempted Village	21,900	371	29,999	341
County	125,790	132	126,383	145
Total for State	442,891	332	397,695	320

[a]Data obtained from Ohio Educational Directory, 1934-1935.
[b]Data obtained from Ohio Educational Directory, 1946-1947.

Although the number of secondary schools and enroll-

ment of students have decreased, the number of teachers in the schools have increased. Hickman, in 1935, found the number of teachers in secondary schools to be 16,003. By 1947, the number of teachers had increased 1,618 to make the total number of teachers 17,621.

Table 4 reveals that city school districts were the only classification of districts that had a decrease in the number of teachers. Both exempted village and county districts exhibit a substantial increase in the number of teachers; the exempted village districts increasing by 565 teachers, while county districts gained an additional 1,119 teachers for its secondary schools.

TABLE 4. NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF OHIO

DISTRICTS	NUMBER OF TEACHERS		
	1935[a]	1947[b]	Increase or Decrease
City	9817	9751	Minus 66
Exempted Village	775	1340	Plus 565
County	5411	6530	Plus 1119
Total Number of Teachers	16003	17621	Plus 1618

[a]Data obtained from John A. Hickman's, Recent Changes in the Distribution of High Schools in the County Districts of Ohio.

[b]Data obtained from Ohio Educational Directory, 1946-1947.

Logically following the decrease in the enrollment and the increase in the number of secondary school teachers, is a decrease in the average number of students per

teacher. All classes of districts show a decrease. The overall decrease, as revealed by Table 5, was from 27.7 students per teacher in 1935, to 22.6 students per teacher in 1947, or a decrease of 5.1 students per teacher. There is less range between the city and county districts; 5.3 being the range in 1947 as compared with 6.8 in 1935.

Exempted village districts obtained the greatest decrease in student-teacher ratio--from 28.2 to 22.4, or a decrease of 5.8 students per teacher. City districts followed with a decrease of 5.3 students per teacher. The least decrease in student-teacher ratio was evident in the county districts; from 23.2 in 1935 to 19.4 in 1947, or a decrease of 3.8 students per teacher. The decrease in the student-teacher ratio can probably be attributed to an increased curriculum, necessitating more teachers, and the acceptance of the widely publicized theory that the teaching and learning processes are increased as the teacher-student ratio is decreased.

TABLE 5. NUMBER OF STUDENTS PER TEACHER IN OHIO SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Districts	1935[a]			1947[b]		
	Enrollment	Teachers	Students per teacher	Enrollment	Teachers	Students per teacher
City	295,201	9,817	30	241,313	9,751	24.7
Exempted Village	21,900	776	28.2	29,999	1,340	22.4
County	125,790	5,411	23.2	126,383	6,530	19.4
Total	442,891	16,003	27.	397,695	17,621	22.6

[a]Data obtained from Ohio Educational Directory, 1934-1935.

[b]Data obtained from Ohio Educational Directory, 1946-1947.

Table 6 reveals that all three classifications of secondary school districts have made an increase in the average number of teachers per school. The overall increase has been from 12.3 in 1935 to 14.2 in 1947, or 1.9 teachers per school; exempted village districts increased by 2.1 teachers; and county school districts increased by 1.8 teachers per school.

The increase in the number of teachers per secondary school is very significant, for it indicates an enlarged curriculum and a lower student-teacher ratio. Probably the increase in number of teachers per county district in secondary schools is due in part to the decrease in number of secondary schools with the resultant increase in

enrollment per school; and the elimination of practically all of the second and third grade secondary schools with their small teaching staffs.

TABLE 6. TEACHERS PER SECONDARY SCHOOL IN OHIO

	1935[a] ARITHMETIC MEAN	1947[b] ARITHMETIC MEAN
City	33.6	34.2
Exempted Village	12.1	15.2
County	5.7	7.5
All Districts	12.3	14.2

[a]Data obtained from Ohio Educational Directory, 1934-1935.

[b]Data obtained from Ohio Educational Directory, 1946-1947.

CHAPTER IV

DISTRIBUTION OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN OHIO

It has been shown in Table 1 that Ohio in 1947 contains 1242 public secondary schools. Of this total, 285 are located in city districts; eighty-eight in exempted village districts; and 869 in county school districts.

Table 7 exhibits the distribution of all public secondary schools by counties. By incorporating the data from Hickman's thesis, showing the distribution of secondary schools by county, comparisons may be made on the changes in distribution that occurred during the period 1935-1947.

Only nine of the eighty-eight counties show any gain in the number of secondary schools, located in their city districts. Cuyahoga county with an increase of four schools; and Lucas and Summit counties with an increase of two schools, lead the state.

Twelve counties decreased their number of city secondary schools. Hamilton county shows the largest decrease with five less. Montgomery and Jefferson counties follow with a decrease of four and two respectively. The other nine counties decreased by only one city school.

Exempted village secondary schools, in contrast to city and county secondary schools, show a gain over the state, during the period 1935-1947. Sixty-one counties include an exempted village district within their boundaries. This constitutes a gain of eighteen over the number of counties which include an exempted village district in 1935.

Twenty counties increased the number of exempted village secondary schools within their limits. Cuyahoga and Hamilton counties increased four, while Columbiana, Lorain, Lucas, Miami, and Stark increased their number by two.

Only two counties, Williams and Wyandot, show any decrease in the number of exempted village secondary schools. Both of these counties lost one school of this category.

It is interesting to note from Table 7 that six counties; namely, Adams, Geauga, Paulding, Pike, Putnam, and Vinton, do not include either a city or exempted village secondary school.

TABLE 7. NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN OHIO BY COUNTIES IN 1935[a] and 1947[b]

COUNTIES	City		Exempted Village		County		Total	
	1935	1947	1935	1947	1935	1947	1935	1947
Adams	0	0	0	0	9	8	9	8
Allen	2	2	0	1	10	8	12	11
Ashland	1	1	0	1	11	8	12	10
Ashtabula	6	6	2	2	21	17	29	25
Athens	3	2	2	2	11	11	16	15
Auglaize	1	2	0	0	7	6	8	8
Belmont	3	2	3	3	9	9	15	14
Brown	0	0	1	1	10	10	11	11
Butler	6	6	0	0	12	14	18	20
Carroll	0	0	0	1	8	6	8	7
Champaign	1	1	1	1	11	10	13	12
Clark	6	6	0	0	15	13	21	19
Clermont	0	0	0	1	10	9	10	10
Clintoh	1	1	0	0	11	11	12	12
Columbiana	4	4	1	3	5	4	10	11
Coshocton	2	1	0	0	14	8	16	9
Crawford	3	3	1	1	10	10	14	14
Cuyahoga	53	57	1	5	14	10	68	72
Darke	1	1	0	1	12	10	13	12
Defiance	1	1	0	1	9	7	10	9
Delaware	1	1	0	0	12	12	13	13
Erie	1	1	0	0	7	7	8	8
Fairfield	1	1	0	0	11	11	12	12
Fayette	1	1	0	0	4	4	5	5
Franklin	21	20	1	1	11	12	33	33
Fulton	0	0	1	1	9	9	10	10
Gallia	1	1	0	0	7	7	8	8
Geauga	0	0	0	0	12	12	12	12
Greene	2	2	1	1	8	8	11	11
Guernsey	1	2	0	1	11	9	12	12

[a]Data obtained from John A. Hickman's Recent Changes in the Distribution of High Schools in the County Districts of Ohio.

[b]Data obtained from Ohio Educational Directory, 1946-1947.

TABLE 7 - Continued

COUNTIES	City		Exempted Village		County		Total	
	1935	1947	1935	1947	1935	1947	1935	1947
Hamilton	28	23	1	5	14	12	43	40
Hancock	4	3	0	0	9	9	13	12
Hardin	1	1	0	1	9	8	10	10
Harrison	0	0	1	1	8	7	9	8
Henry	0	0	1	1	9	8	10	9
Highland	0	0	2	2	9	7	11	9
Hocking	2	2	0	0	8	7	10	9
Holmes	0	0	1	1	8	9	9	10
Huron	2	2	1	1	7	7	10	10
Jackson	2	2	0	0	4	4	6	6
Jefferson	5	3	1	1	13	12	19	16
Knox	2	1	0	0	8	7	10	8
Lake	1	2	0	1	7	6	8	9
Lawrence	1	1	1	1	12	11	14	13
Licking	5	5	0	0	16	13	21	18
Logan	1	1	0	0	13	13	14	14
Lorain	7	6	1	3	18	16	26	25
Lucas	8	10	0	2	12	7	20	19
Madison	0	0	1	1	9	10	10	11
Mahoning	12	11	1	1	13	12	26	24
Marion	4	4	0	0	13	12	17	16
Medina	1	1	1	1	14	14	16	16
Meigs	0	0	3	3	6	6	9	9
Mercer	0	0	1	1	10	7	11	8
Miami	4	4	1	3	11	8	16	15
Monroe	0	0	1	1	11	11	12	12
Montgomery	15	11	1	1	14	14	30	26
Morgan	0	0	1	1	7	6	8	7
Morrow	0	0	0	1	9	7	9	8
Muskingum	4	4	0	0	12	12	16	16

TABLE 7 - Continued

COUNTIES	City		Exempted Village		County		Total	
	1935	1947	1935	1947	1935	1947	1935	1947
Noble	0	0	1	1	10	8	11	9
Ottawa	0	0	1	1	7	5	8	6
Paulding	0	0	0	0	8	7	8	7
Perry	0	0	2	2	10	9	12	11
Pickaway	1	1	0	0	13	12	14	13
Pike	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	6
Portage	2	2	0	0	21	21	23	23
Preble	0	0	1	1	12	12	13	13
Putnam	0	0	0	0	14	12	14	12
Richland	4	4	0	0	10	9	14	13
Ross	1	1	0	1	11	10	12	12
Sandusky	1	1	2	2	5	5	8	8
Scioto	4	3	0	0	8	10	12	13
Seneca	3	3	0	0	9	10	12	13
Shelby	1	1	0	0	8	8	9	9
Stark	11	11	0	2	17	16	28	29
Summit	14	16	0	0	17	17	31	33
Trumbull	7	8	2	2	25	25	34	35
Tuscarawus	4	4	2	2	13	11	19	17
Union	0	0	2	2	15	12	17	14
Van Wert	2	2	0	0	9	9	11	11
Vinton	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	6
Warren	0	0	2	2	9	7	11	9
Washington	1	2	1	1	11	11	13	14
Wayne	1	1	1	2	16	13	18	16
Williams	0	1	2	1	7	7	9	9
Wood	2	2	1	2	24	21	27	25
Wyandot	0	0	3	2	9	8	12	10
TOTALS	291	285	59	88	954	869	1304	1242

Table 8 was formulated to reveal the number of county secondary schools located in each county in Ohio for the school year 1946-1947. Again the results of Hickman's study are used in order to show a comparison of the distribution of county secondary schools in each county for 1935 and the present distribution.

The total number of county secondary schools has decreased during the period 1935-1947 by eighty-five. Forty-nine counties reflect this decrease. Coshocton decreased its number by six; Lucas by five; and Cuyahoga and Ashtabula by four to lead the counties in this category.

Only six counties exhibit an increase in their number of county secondary schools. Butler and Scioto increased by two; while Franklin, Holmes, Madison, and Seneca increased by one, the number of county secondary schools within their boundaries.

Thirty-three counties show no change in their number of county secondary schools.

TABLE 8. THE DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTY SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE COUNTIES OF OHIO

COUNTIES	1935[a]	1947[b]	INCREASE	DECREASE
Adams	9	8		1
Allen	10	8		2
Ashland	11	8		3
Ashtabula	21	17		4
Athens	11	11		
Auglaize	7	6		1
Belmont	9	9		
Brown	10	10		
Butler	12	14	2	
Carroll	8	6		2
Champaign	11	10		1
Clark	15	13		2
Clermont	10	9		1
Clinton	11	11		
Columbiana	5	4		1
Coshocton	14	8		6
Crawford	10	10		
Cuyahoga	14	10		4
Darke	12	10		2
Defiance	9	7		2
Delaware	12	12		
Erie	7	7		
Fairfield	11	11		
Fayette	4	4		
Franklin	11	12	1	
Fulton	9	9		
Gallia	7	7		
Geauga	12	12		
Greene	8	8		
Guernsey	11	9		2

[a]Data obtained from John A. Hickman's, Recent Changes in the Distribution of High Schools in the County Districts of Ohio.

[b]Data obtained from Ohio Educational Directory, 1946-1947.

TABLE 8 - Continued

COUNTIES	1935[a]	1947[b]	INCREASE	DECREASE
Hamilton	14	12		2
Hancock	9	9		
Hardin	9	8		1
Harrison	8	7		1
Henry	9	8		1
Highland	9	7		2
Hocking	8	7		1
Holmes	8	9	1	
Huron	7	7		
Jackson	4	4		
Jefferson	13	12		1
Knox	8	7		1
Lake	7	6		1
Lawrence	12	11		1
Licking	16	13		3
Logan	13	13		
Lorain	18	16		2
Lucas	12	7		5
Madison	9	10	1	
Mahoning	13	12		1
Marion	13	12		1
Medina	14	14		
Meigs	6	6		
Mercer	10	7		3
Miami	11	8		3
Monroe	11	11		
Montgomery	14	14		
Morgan	7	6		1
Morrow	9	7		2
Muskingum	12	12		

TABLE 8 - Continued

COUNTIES	1935[a]	1947[b]	INCREASE	DECREASE
Noble	10	8		2
Ottawa	7	5		2
Paulding	8	7		1
Perry	10	9		1
Pickaway	13	12		1
Pike	6	6		
Portage	21	21		
Preble	12	12		
Putnam	14	12		2
Richland	10	9		1
Ross	11	10		1
Sandusky	5	5		
Scioto	8	10	2	
Seneca	9	10	1	
Shelby	8	8		
Stark	17	16		1
Summit	17	17		
Trumbull	25	25		
Tuscarawus	13	11		2
Union	15	12		3
Van Wert	9	9		
Vinton	6	6		
Warren	9	7		2
Washington	11	11		
Wayne	16	13		3
Williams	7	7		
Wood	24	21		3
Wyandot	9	8		1

The mere fact that the number of county secondary schools has decreased is evidence that the schools in operation are, on the average, larger than they were twelve years ago. However, the distribution of county secondary schools take on added significance when the relative location of each is considered. Tables 9, 10, and 11 exhibit the present location of county secondary schools in regard to each other, and also changes which have occurred during the past twelve years.

Table 9 was prepared from data obtained the Principal's Reports to the State Department of Education for the school year 1945-1946, and the Ohio Educational Directory, 1946-1947. It was necessary to use the Principal's Reports for 1945-1946, since it is the last year which gives the names and distances to the three nearest secondary schools. By using the Ohio Educational Directory for 1946-1947, it was possible to eliminate all schools which existed in 1945-1946, but which had become non-existent for the school year 1946-1947.

Under section VI of the Principal's Reports for 1945-1946, all principals are asked to name the three nearest schools and the distance to each. There was found on file in the office of the Secondary School Supervisors, in the State Department of Education, a report

from each of the 869 county secondary schools. However four reports neglected to designate any of the three nearest schools, while two more reports failed to mention the third nearest secondary school. Therefore, data for 865 of the 869 county secondary schools were obtained for the first and second nearest schools, and for 863 of the 869 schools for the third nearest secondary school.

Table 9 was prepared to show the distribution of all county secondary schools in each county in relation to the three nearest secondary schools. The interval is one mile except the first mile and all over fifteen miles.

Table 10 is a summary of Hickman's results, obtained from a table, similar to Table 9 of this study. Hickman's results are for 1935 and it will be noticed 954 county secondary schools were in existence at that time. His results were complete with the exception of one report, which neglected to designate the third nearest secondary school. Since there were more schools existing in 1935 than in 1947, the percentage of the total number of schools falling into each interval is designated, in order to facilitate better comparison between the distribution of 1935 and 1947.

Referring to the column indicating the nearest secondary school in Table 11, two schools are found to be within one-half mile of the nearest secondary school, while two schools are reported to be between twelve and thirteen miles from the nearest secondary school. The median school is found to be in the interval four and one-tenth and five miles. Over one-fourth of the schools are placed in this interval.

In the column indicating the second nearest school, one school reported that its second nearest school was between one and one-tenth miles. The median second nearest school is found to be in the same interval as the median nearest school--four and one-tenth to five miles. Two schools report that their second nearest school is over fifteen miles.

The column referring to the third nearest secondary school has five schools reporting the third nearest to be between two and one-tenth and three miles. At the other extreme thirteen schools report the third nearest secondary school to be over fifteen miles. The interval seven and one-tenth to eight miles contains the median school reporting the third nearest secondary school.

Using Table 10 for comparison of the findings of the study made in 1935 with those for 1947, it is found

that in each study the median interval is the same for the nearest secondary school. Likewise there were two schools which reported the nearest school to be between one-tenth and five-tenth miles; but two schools report the nearest secondary school to be further than any school did in 1947. Although the median is the same for both studies, a careful comparison of the percentage of schools in each interval, reveals a tendency for the school to concentrate toward the median.

Comparing the two results for the columns headed "second nearest" reveals the median to remain the same. However, the tendency is for the percentage of schools below the median to decrease, and the percentage of schools above the median to increase.

Only under the third nearest secondary is there a change in the median interval. In 1935, the median was six and one-tenth to seven miles, while in 1947, it has increased to the interval seven and one-tenth to eight miles.

TABLE 9. RELATIVE LOCATION OF COUNTY SECONDARY SCHOOLS FOR 1947

COUNTY AND NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOL GIVING THAT REPLY		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS																
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Adams	1st.				2	1	1					2			1			
(8)	2nd.						1	2				1		1		2		
7 reported	3rd.							1			1				1	2	1	1
Allen	1st.					4	2	1				1						
(8)	2nd.					1	2	3	1			1						
	3rd.							2		1		2	2	1				
Ashland	1st.					4	3	1										
(8)	2nd.						3	1	1	2	1							
	3rd.							1	2		4							
Ashtabula	1st.		3	2	1	4	4	1	1			1						
(17)	2nd.					3	5	4	2	1		2						
	3rd.					1	2	3	3		1	5	2					
Athens	1st.		1	1	2	2	1			1	2		1					
(11)	2nd.				1	1	2	1		2	1	1		2				
	3rd.					1	1	1	1	2		2				2	1	
Auglaize	1st.				2	1	1		1		1							
(6)	2nd.				1			3			1	1						
	3rd.						1		1	2		1		1				

TABLE 9 - Continued

COUNTY AND NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS GIVING THAT REPLY		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS																
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Belmont	1st.			1	1	2	1	1	1	2								
(9)	2nd.						1		2	1	2	2		1				
	3rd						1			1	1	5					1	
Brown	1st.		1			1		3	3	1		1						
(10)	2nd.						1		3	1	1	3		1				
(9)	3rd							1	1	1		3		2		1		
Butler	1st.				3	1	4	2	3	1								
(14)	2nd.				1	1	2	2	5	2	1							
	3rd.							1	7	3	2	1						
Carroll	1st.				1		2	3										
(6)	2nd.						2	1		2		1						
	3rd.									1		1	1		2			1
Champaign	1st.				2	4	1	3										
(10)	2nd.					1	3	2	2	2								
	3rd.						1	2	2	4	1							
Clark	1st.				2	5	5		1									
(13)	2nd.				1	1	3	1	3	2	1	1						
	3rd.						1	2	2	5		1	1	1				

TABLE 9 - Continued

COUNTY AND NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS GIVING THAT REPLY		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS																
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Clermont (9)	1st.					1	1	1	2	3	1							
	2nd.					1			3	4								
	3rd.								2		2		2	3				
Clinton (11)	1st.			1	1		4	2	3									
	2nd.						2	2	1	4	2							
	3rd.								1	3	5	2						
Columbiana (4)	1st.			1	1	1						1						
	2nd.					1	2							1				
	3rd.					1	1					1		1				
Coshocton (8)	1st.		1			2		3		1	1							
	2nd.							3	1	1	1		1	1				
	3rd.							1	1	2	1	1		2				
Crawford (10)	1st.				1	2	3	2	2									
	2nd.						3		7									
	3rd.						1		7	2								
Cuyahoga (10)	1st.			2		4	4											
	2nd.				2	1	6	1										
	3rd.					1	4	3			1							

TABLE 9 - Continued

County and Number of Secondary Schools Giving that Reply		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS															
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Darke (10)	1st.	1			1	3	3	2										
	2nd.					1	2	3	1	2	1							
	3rd.							1	4	3	1	1						
Defiance (7)	1st.					1	3	2		1								
	2nd.							3	1	2						1		
	3rd.								1	3		2				1		
Delaware (12)	1st.			2		1	6	1	1	1								
	2nd.						3	3	2	4								
	3rd.						1	5	1	3		1		1				
Erie (7)	1st.					2	1	2	2									
	2nd.					1		1	1	4								
	3rd.								2	2		1	1	1				
Fairfield (11)	1st.				3	3	3	1	1									
	2nd.				1			3	6		1							
	3rd.				1				3	2	2	1	1	1				
Fayette (4)	1st.				1		1		2									
	2nd.						1	1	1			1						
	3rd.											2	1	1				

TABLE 9 - Continued

COUNTY AND NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS GIVING THAT REPLY		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS																
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1.-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Franklin	1st.				1	3	3	2		3								
(12)	2nd.					2	2	4	1	1	1	1						
	3rd.						1	3	3	2		3						
Fulton	1st.					1	3	1	3	1								
(9)	2nd.							2	1	4	2							
	3rd.								2	3	1	3						
Gallia	1st.							3	2	1					1			
(7)	2nd.									4	1			1		1		
	3rd.										2	2		1			1	1
Geauga	1st.					3	6	2				1						
(12)	2nd.						7	3				1		1				
	3rd.						5	2	1	1		2			1			
Greene	1st.					2	3	3										
(8)	2nd.						3	1	4									
	3rd.						1	1	2	3	1							
Guernsey	1st.			2	3	1	1			1	1							
(9)	2nd.				2	2		1	1		2					1		
	3rd.				1	2	1	1	1		1	1					1	

TABLE 9 - Continued

COUNTY AND NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS GIVING THAT REPLY		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS																
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Hamilton	1st.				6	2		2			2							
(12)	2nd.				3	4		1		1	1			2				
	3rd.					2	4	1		2				1	1		1	
Hancock	1st.			1	1	2	2	1	1		1							
(9)	2nd.							4	2	1	1	1						
	3rd.							1		3	2		1	2				
Hardin	1st.				3	3	1			1								
(8)	2nd.					1		2	3	1			1					
	3rd.						1	1			3	2	1					
Harrison	1st.						4	2						1				
(7)	2nd.							2	2	1		1		1				
	3rd.							1	1	1		2		2				
Henry	1st.							4	3		1							
(8)	2nd.								5		2	1						
	3rd.								1	2	2	3						
Highland	1st.					2		1	1	2		1						
(7)	2nd.					1			2	1	1	1	1					
	3rd.							1				3	1	2				

TABLE 9 - Continued

COUNTY AND NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS GIVING THAT REPLY		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS																
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Hocking	1st.		1		1	2			1	2								
(7)	2nd.				1	1		1	1		1	2						
	3rd.								2		2		1	1			1	
Holmes	1st.			2			1	5	1									
(9)	2nd.						1	4	2	1	1							
	3rd.							2	2	1	3			1				
Huron	1st.				1	1	2	2		1								
(7)	2nd.					1		2		3	1							
	3rd.									3	2	1		1				
Jackson	1st.						3			1								
(4)	2nd.						3					1						
	3rd.						2			1				1				
Jefferson	1st.		1		2	3	2	1	1	2								
(12)	2nd.						2	1	2	3		2		1		1		
	3rd.							1		6		1		1	1	1		1
Knox	1st.					1	2	2	1		1							
(7)	2nd.						1	1	2	1	1		1					
	3rd.									1	1	3	1	1				

TABLE 9 - Continued

COUNTY AND NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS GIVING THAT REPLY		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS																
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Lake	1st.				1	1	3	1										
(6)	2nd.						4		2									
	3rd.						2	2	1			1						
Lawrence	1st.				1	1	4	1		2	1	1						
(11)	2nd.					1	1		1	2		3	1	1		1		
	3rd.					1	1			1		2	2	1		2	1	
Licking	1st.				2	5	3	2		1								
(13)	2nd.						6	4	1	1			1					
	3rd.						1	2	1	3	1	2		3				
Logan	1st.				2	4	3	4										
(13)	2nd.					1	3	5	1	3								
	3rd.							4	4	2	3							
Lorain	1st.				1	8	7											
(16)	2nd.					4	7	4	1									
	3rd.						9	4	2			1						
Lucas	1st.				2	2	3											
(7)	2nd.					2	3	1				1						
	3rd.						3	1				1	2					

TABLE 9 - Continued

COUNTY AND NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS GIVING THAT REPLY		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS																
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Madison	1st.					2	2	3	1	2								
(10)	2nd.					1	1		2	3	1	2						
	3rd.					1	1		1	1	2	2	1	1				
Mahoning	1st.		1	1	4	1	3	2										
(12)	2nd.				1	5	2	1	1		1	1						
	3rd.						3	4	1		2	2						
Marion	1st.					2	8	2										
(12)	2nd.						4	4	3	1								
	3rd.						1	4		4	2			1				
Medina	1st.	1			1	1	11											
(14)	2nd.				1		12	1										
	3rd.					1	9	2	2									
Meigs	1st.						2	1	1	1		1						
(6)	2nd.							1	1		3			1				
	3rd.								1			2	1			2		
Mercer	1st.					2		2	1									
(7)	2nd.							1		3	1							
5 Reported	3rd.								1			2	1	1				

TABLE 9 - Continued

COUNTY AND NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS GIVING THAT REPLY		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS																
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Miami	1st.				1	3	4											
(8)	2nd.						4	2	1	1								
	3rd.							3	3		1	1						
Monroe	1st.						3	1	2	1	1	2		1				
(11)	2nd.							1	1	4		2	1	1			1	
	3rd.								1	2	1	1		3		1	2	
Montgomery	1st.			1	3	4	3	3										
(14)	2nd.					5	5	3	1									
	3rd.					3	3	4	2	1	1							
Morgan	1st.						1	4		1								
(6)	2nd.								2	1		1	1	1				
	3rd.										1	1	1	3				
Morrow	1st.			1			1	3	2									
(7)	2nd.							2	3	1	1							
	3rd.								1	2	2	1		1				
Muskingum	1st.				2			3	1	4		2						
(12)	2nd.							1	1	3	2	1	2	2				
	3rd.									1	1	2	4	1	2		1	

TABLE 9 - Continued

COUNTY AND NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS GIVING THAT REPLY		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS															
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Noble (8)	1st.			1		1	2	1	1	1		1						
	2nd.						1	1	2	3		1						
	3rd.										1	4		2		1		
Ottawa (5)	1st.						2			1		2						
	2nd.						1	1						1	1			1
	3rd.									1	1			1				2
Paulding (7)	1st.					3		2	2									
	2nd.						1	1	1	2		2						
	3rd.								1		2	2	2					
Perry (9)	1st.				3	1	3	1	1									
	2nd						1	1	5	2								
	3rd.							1	2		3	1	1	1				
Pickaway (12)	1st.				2	4	2	3										
	2nd.				1		3	2	3	1	1	1						
	3rd						1	2	1	4	1		3					
Pike (6)	1st.						2		2	1	1							
	2nd.									2		1	1	1			1	
	3rd.													4				2

TABLE 9 - Continued

COUNTY AND NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS GIVING THAT REPLY		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS																
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Portage (21)	1st.		1		4	6	10											
	2nd.					3	16	2										
	3rd.						18	2			1							
Preble (12)	1st.			1	1	2	3	2	2	1								
	2nd.					1	3	1	4	2	1							
	3rd.						1	1	3	1	6							
Putnam (12)	1st.			2	2	1		2	3	1	1							
	2nd.						2	2	4	3	1							
	3rd.							1	3	7	1							
Richland (9)	1st.				1	2	2	2	1	1								
	2nd.						1	3	2	3								
	3rd.								2	3	1		1	2				
Ross (10)	1st.			1	1	2	2	1				2		1				
	2nd.					1	1		1	1	1	4				1		
	3rd.						1		1		2	4					1	1
Sandusky (5)	1st.				1	2	1	1										
	2nd.					1	1	2			1							
	3rd.						1	1	2			1						

TABLE 9 - Continued

COUNTY AND NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS GIVING THAT REPLY		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS																
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Scioto (10)	1st.				2		1	4	1			2						
	2nd.						1	2	1	1	2	1	1		1			
	3rd.								1	2	1	1	1	2			1	1
Seneca (10) 9 Reported	1st					1	2	5	1									
	2nd.						1	3	4	1								
	3rd.							1	3	2	3							
Shelby (8)	1st.				1	2	2	1	1	1								
	2nd.					1	1	1	1	3		1						
	3rd.							1		3	2	2						
Stark (16)	1st.			2	3	6	4		1									
	2nd.				1	1	9	2	2			1						
	3rd.				1	1	2	3	3	3	1	2						
Summit (17)	1st.			3	1	10	3											
	2nd.				1	7	8		1									
	3rd.				1	2	10	2	1					1				
Trumbull (25)	1st.			1	2	5	17											
	2nd.				2		22		1									
	3rd.				1	1	20	2	1									

TABLE 9 - Continued

COUNTY AND NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS GIVING THAT REPLY		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS																
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Tuscarawus (11)	1st.					2	1	4	3	1								
	2nd.					1	1	3	2	3		1						
	3rd.						1	3	2		1	3		1				
Union (12)	1st.				3	4	3	2										
	2nd.					1	3	7	1									
	3rd.							6	2	2	2							
Van Wert (9)	1st.				1	2	1	5										
	2nd.						2		5	1		1						
	3rd.						1		2	4			1	1				
Vinton (6)	1st.				1			2			2		1					
	2nd.							1	1	1	1	1						1
	3rd.								1			1	1	2				1
Warren (7)	1st.			1		3	2	1										
	2nd.						3		2	1	1							
	3rd.						1		2	1	2	1						
Washington (11)	1st.		2	1					1	3	1	2		1				
	2nd.									1	1	5	1	1	1		1	
	3rd.											2	2	2		3		2

TABLE 9 - Continued

COUNTY AND NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS GIVING THAT REPLY		DISTANCE IN MILES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS																
		0.1-0.5	0.6-1.0	1.1-2.0	2.1-3.0	3.1-4.0	4.1-5.0	5.1-6.0	6.1-7.0	7.1-8.0	8.1-9.0	9.1-10.0	10.1-11.0	11.1-12.0	12.1-13.0	13.1-14.0	14.1-15.0	Over 15.0
Wayne	1st.				1	4	3	3	1	1								
(13)	2nd.					1	4	1	4	1	2							
	3rd.					1	2	1	2	3	3	1						
Williams	1st.						2	3	1	1								
(7)	2nd.							3	1	2	1							
	3rd.							1	2	2		2						
Wood	1st.			3	3	5	4	4	2									
(21)	2nd.			1	1	7	2	6	3	1								
	3rd.					2		5	7	6		1						
Wyandot	1st						3	3	1		1							
(8)	2nd.							4	2	1		1						
	3rd.							1	2	1	1	1	2					

TABLE 10. SUMMARY OF THE DISTANCES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS FOR 1935[a]

DISTANCE IN MILES	FIRST NEAREST		SECOND NEAREST		THIRD NEAREST	
	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
0.1-0.5	2	.21	0	.00	0	.00
0.6-1.0	17	1.78	0	.00	0	.00
1.1-2.0	44	4.61	3	.31	0	.00
2.1-3.0	121	12.68	35	3.67	9	.94
3.1-4.0	184	19.29	85	8.91	25	2.62
4.1-5.0	273	28.62	226	23.69	125	13.12
5.1-6.0	144	15.10	190	19.92	135	14.17
6.1-7.0	67	7.02	143	14.99	166	17.42
7.1-8.0	57	5.99	98	10.28	128	13.43
8.1-9.0	18	1.89	72	7.55	108	11.33
9.1-10.0	16	1.68	60	6.29	104	10.91
10.1-11.0	4	.42	20	2.10	38	3.99
11.1-12.0	4	.42	11	1.15	54	5.67
12.1-13.0	1	.10	1	.10	10	1.05
13.1-14.0	2	.21	6	.63	19	1.99
14.1-15.0	0	.00	3	.31	14	1.47
Over 15.0	0	.00	1	.10	18	1.89
Total	954	100.00	954	100.00	953	100.00

[a]Data obtained from John A. Hickman's Recent Changes in the Distribution of High Schools in the County Districts of Ohio.

TABLE 11. SUMMARY OF THE DISTANCES TO THE THREE NEAREST SECONDARY SCHOOLS FOR 1947.

DISTANCE IN MILES	FIRST NEAREST		SECOND NEAREST		THIRD NEAREST	
	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
0.1-0.5	2	.23	0		0	
0.6-1.0	12	1.39	0		0	
1.1-2.0	34	3.93	1	.12	0	
2.1-3.0	95	10.98	21	2.43	5	.58
3.1-4.0	179	20.69	68	7.86	20	2.32
4.1-5.0	225	26.01	202	23.35	121	14.02
5.1-6.0	146	16.88	151	17.46	104	12.05
6.1-7.0	70	8.09	146	16.88	123	14.25
7.1-8.0	51	5.90	117	13.53	131	15.18
8.1-9.0	19	2.20	50	5.78	94	10.89
9.1-10.0	24	2.78	57	6.59	109	12.63
10.1-11.0	2	.23	13	1.50	42	4.87
11.1-12.0	4	.46	22	2.54	63	7.30
12.1-13.0	2	.23	4	.46	9	1.04
13.1-14.0	0		8	.92	16	1.85
14.1-15.0	0		3	.35	13	1.51
Over 15.0	0		2	.23	13	1.51
Total	865	100.00	865	100.00	863	100.00

CHAPTER V

THE DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTY SECONDARY SCHOOLS, BY ENROLLMENT

Educators have long been cognizant of the deficiencies of the small secondary school. These schools, with their small enrollments, generally have small faculties and a curtailed curriculum. Consequently, the educational advantages offered in small secondary schools do not equal the advantages offered by larger schools.

Table 12 separates all county secondary schools in each county into four groups according to enrollment. These groups are A (1-50), B (51-100), C (101-200), D (over 200). It is not meant to infer that any of these groups represent the optimum enrollment. The divisions were made to show the relative size of the county secondary schools.

The enrollment for 1946-1947 were computed from the Principals' Reports to the State Department of Education. The reports give the enrollments as of October 1, 1946. Since the reports cover the school year 1946-1947, the enrollments will hereafter be referred to as those for 1947.

From the Educational Directory for 1934-1935, enroll-

ments were secured for all county secondary schools in operation at that time. These schools were separated into the same enrollment groups as the present schools, and included in Table 12. This was done to show any changes in the distribution of county secondary schools, by enrollment, which have occurred during the period 1935-1947.

When making comparisons between the enrollments of 1935 with those of 1947, it must be remembered that during this period the total number of county secondary schools reduced from 954 to 869. This is a reduction of eighty-five schools.

Considering the first enrollment group--those schools having an enrollment of fifty or less and in Group A--it is found that in 1947 there were fifty-one schools within this group. Thirty-five counties contained one or more of these schools. Union county and Monroe county with four, lead the counties in this category. Schools with an enrollment in Group A comprise 5.87% of the total number of county secondary schools.

Comparing the present situation with that existing in 1935, one finds a decided improvement. There were 136 schools included in enrollment Group A in 1935. Sixty counties included at least one of these schools

within its boundaries. Coshocton and Union counties, with eight, led the counties in the number of schools of this category. The percentage of the number of schools which were within this enrollment group was 14.26%.

Turning to the second enrollment group, which includes all schools with enrollments within Group B, it is found that 227 are within this group. Seventy-three counties contain these schools, Portage and Wood counties each containing eleven. The 227 schools represent 26.12% of the total number of secondary schools.

However, in 1935, there were 283 county secondary schools contained within enrollment Group B. Eighty counties included one or more of the schools, led by Ashtabula and Wood with nine each. The number of schools within the second enrollment group was 29.66% of the number of secondary schools in the counties of Ohio.

To make a further comparison, the total number of county secondary schools having an enrollment of 100 or less, has decreased from 419 to 278 since 1935. In 1935, 43.92% had an enrollment of 100 or less, while by 1947, the percentage had dropped to 31.99%.

In 1935 only four counties--Columbiana, Franklin, Lake, and Stark--did not contain one secondary school having an enrollment of 100 or less. However, in 1947,

eleven counties--Auglaize, Coshocton, Cuyahoga, Franklin, Hancock, Henry, Jefferson, Lake, Lawrence, Lucas, and Scioto--did not contain a single school within enrollment Groups A and B. In fact, Coshocton county, which now contains no schools of Groups A and B; in 1935 contained twelve of them.

The largest number of Ohio county secondary schools falls in the enrollment Group C--101 to 200. The number of schools in this group is 397 and comprises 45.69% of the number of secondary schools. Every county, with the exception of Monroe and Morgan, contains one or more of these schools. Athens and Medina counties, with ten each, lead the counties in the number of schools having an enrollment included in Group C.

In 1935, this enrollment group also contained more schools than any other group. The 370 schools of this group represented 38.78% of the county secondary schools existing at that time. Only three counties--Ashland, Defiance, and Holmes--were without one of these schools.

The fourth enrollment Group D includes all schools with an enrollment over 200. In 1947, Ohio has 194 county secondary schools within this group. They comprise 22.32% of the county secondary schools contained in Ohio. Sixty-two counties report one or more schools within

enrollment Group D. The counties are led by Hamilton, Jefferson, Montgomery, and Summit, each of which nine schools of this group.

In contrast, 1935 saw Ohio with 165 county secondary schools within Group D and they comprised 17.30% of the county secondary schools existing at that time. Sixty-three counties included one or more schools of this enrollment group, with Cuyahoga and Jefferson counties leading, containing eleven and nine schools, respectively.

By combining the last two enrollment groups, it can be shown that there was a substantial gain in the number of county secondary schools with an enrollment over 100. The number has increased from 535 in 1935 to 591 in 1947. The gain in the percentage of schools included in enrollment Groups C and D is more prominent. The gain has been from 56.08% in 1935 to 68.01% in 1947. For both years, only one county failed to include one of these schools--Holmes in 1935 and Morgan in 1947.

Several reasons may be cited for the fact that, in general, county secondary schools have gained in their enrollments since 1935. They include:

1. Reorganization of many secondary schools to include six years--grades 7-12. The additional two grades, consequently, increased the secondary school enrollment.

2. Elimination of many second and third grade secondary schools.

3. Realization of the principle that one school with an enrollment of 100 is more economical to operate than two schools with an enrollment of fifty each.

TABLE 12. THE DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTY SECONDARY SCHOOLS, ACCORDING TO ENROLLMENT.

	1-50		51-100		101-200		Over 200	
COUNTIES	1935[a]	1947[b]	1935	1947	1935	1947	1935	1947
Adams	1		3	1	2	4	3	3
Allen	1		4	1	1	3	4	4
Ashland	4	1	6	3		4	1	
Ashtabula	5	2	9	8	6	5	1	2
Athens	1			1	9	10	1	
Auglaize			4		3	5		1
Belmont			4	4	4	2	1	3
Brown		1	3	2	6	6	1	1
Butler			3	2	6	6	2	6
Carroll	1	1	2	1	4	3	1	1
Champaign	2		6	6	3	4		
Clark	1	1	5	3	9	8		1
Clermont			1	1	7	3	2	5
Clinton	2	1	3	4	5	5	1	1
Columbiana				1	3	3	2	
Coshocton	8		4		2	7		1
Crawford	1		4	7	5	3		
Cuyahoga			1		2	2	11	8
Darke	1	1	3	2	6	5	2	2
Defiance	3		5	3		4	1	
Delaware	2	1	5	7	4	4	1	
Erie	1	1	2		4	3		3
Fairfield	1			3	6	5	4	3
Fayette			2	2	2	2		
Franklin					5	5	6	7

[a]Data obtained from Ohio Educational Directory, 1934-1935

[b]Data obtained from Principals' Report to the State Department of Education for the School Year 1946-1947

TABLE 12. THE DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTY SECONDARY SCHOOLS, ACCORDING TO ENROLLMENT.

	1-50		51-100		101-200		Over 200	
COUNTIES	1935[a]	1947[b]	1935	1947	1935	1947	1935	1947
Fulton			1	1	5	5	3	3
Gallia		1	3	1	4	4		1
Geauga	5	1	3	5	3	5	1	1
Greene			1	1	5	5	2	2
Guernsey	1		6	4	3	5	1	
Hamilton	1		1	1	6	2	6	9
Hancock			1		6	8	2	1
Hardin			5	2	3	6	1	
Harrison	2	1	2	2	4	4		
Henry	1		4		2	5	2	3
Highland	3	2	3	2	2	2	1	1
Hocking	3	2	2	1	2	4	1	
Holmes	3		5	6		3		
Huron			2	2	4	4	1	1
Jackson	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Jefferson	2		1		1	3	9	9
Knox	3	1	2	1	2	3	1	2
Lake					1	1	6	5
Lawrence	1		3		7	8	1	3
Licking	4		5	2	6	7	1	4
Logan		1	1	4	11	8	1	
Lorain	4	2	6	7	4	4	4	3
Lucas	2		3		2	2	5	5
Madison	2	2	4	3	3	5		
Mahoning	2		1	2	6	2	4	8
Marion	3	2	6	4	4	6		
Medina	1		2	4	10	10	1	
Meigs	1	1		1	3	3	2	1
Mercer	4	1	3		3	3		3
Miami	1		4	3	3	3	3	2

TABLE 12. THE DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTY SECONDARY SCHOOLS, ACCORDING TO ENROLLMENT.

	1-50		51-100		101-200		Over 200	
COUNTIES	1935[a]	1947[b]	1935	1947	1935	1947	1935	1947
Monroe	4	4	5	6	2			1
Montgomery			2	1	4	4	8	9
Morgan	1	1	5	5	1			
Morrow	1		2	2	4	4	2	1
Muskingum	1	1	2	3	6	4	3	4
Noble	3	2	4	4	3	2		
Ottawa	2	1	1		1	2	3	2
Paulding	1		3	2	3	4	1	1
Perry	1			1	6	8	3	
Pickaway	3		7	9	3	3		
Pike			1	1	3	3	2	2
Portage	3	1	8	11	8	8	2	1
Preble			2	1	9	8	1	3
Putnam	3		5	4	5	5	3	3
Richland	1		3	1	4	5	2	3
Ross			2	2	7	6	2	2
Sandusky			2	2	3	3		
Scioto			2		4	2	2	8
Seneca			6	2	2	8	1	
Shelby	1		4	2	2	5	1	1
Stark				1	10	7	7	8
Summit	1		6	1	6	7	4	9
Trumbull	1	1	2	8	15	9	7	7
Tuscarawus	4		5	3	4	7		1
Union	8	5	6	3	1	3		1
Van Wert		1	5	5	2	3	2	
Vinton			4	3	2	2		1
Warren	2		3	2	4	4		1
Washington		1	2	3	9			
Wayne	3	2	6	2	5	6	2	3

TABLE 12. THE DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTY SECONDARY SCHOOLS, ACCORDING TO ENROLLMENT.

	1-50		51-100		101-200		Over 200	
COUNTIES	1935[a]	1947[b]	1935	1947	1935	1947	1935	1947
Williams	1	2	1		5	4		1
Wood	5		9	11	8	9	2	1
Wyandot	1	1	7	4	1	3		
Totals	136	51	283	227	370	397	165	194

County secondary schools are organized into several divisions. The largest division is made up of secondary schools chartered as first grade. The first grade secondary schools are further divided into four and six year secondary schools. Two schools in Franklin county are five year schools, but will be treated as six-year secondary schools.

Tables 13 and 14 separate all county secondary schools into different enrollment groups, according to their functional organization. The enrollment groups are the same as those used in Table 12. Table 13 includes all county secondary schools chartered as first grade and functioning as six-year and four-year secondary schools. Of the 869 county secondary schools, 849 are chartered as first grade; 698 functioning as six-year and 151 as four-year schools.

Table 13 reveals that for the school year ending in 1947, there were thirty-five four-year and thirteen six-year secondary schools within enrollment Group A--fifty or less. The thirty-five four-year schools are 23.18% of the number of four-year secondary schools, while the thirteen six-year schools are only 1.86% of the number of six-year county secondary schools.

Enrollment Group B includes fifty-eight four-year and 163 six-year schools. The fifty-eight four-year schools represent 38.41% of the total number of four-year secondary schools, and it is in this enrollment group that the largest number of four-year schools are found. Of all the six-year secondary schools, 23.35% are contained in enrollment Group B.

Adding the first two enrollment groups together gives the number of secondary schools with enrollments of 100 or under. It is significant that 61.59% of the four-year secondary schools have an enrollment within Groups A and B. In contrast, 25.21% of the six-year secondary schools are found in the first two enrollment groups.

The enrollment Group C--101 to 200--includes the largest number of six-year secondary schools. They number 355 and are 50.86% of the number of six-year

county secondary schools. Only thirty-two or 21.19% of the four-year secondary schools are included in Group C.

The fourth enrollment group, which includes schools with enrollments over 200, contains twenty-six four-year and 167 six-year secondary schools. The twenty-six four-year schools are 17.22% of the number of four-year secondary schools, while the 167 six-year schools comprise 23.93% of the total number of six-year secondary schools.

Joining the last two enrollment groups gives the number of four and six-year county secondary schools with an enrollment over 100. It is in this division that the six-year secondary shows its overwhelming majority. The percentage of six-year schools having an enrollment over 100 is 74.79%, while the percentage of four-year schools is much lower, being 38.41%.

The six-year secondary school has become the most prominent type in Ohio. This is demonstrated by the fact that 698 or 80.44% of the county secondary schools function as six-year schools. Twenty-eight counties have all secondary schools conforming to this organizational plan. Every county contains one or more six-year secondary schools. In eighty-five counties, the majority of secondary schools are organized as six-year

schools. In two counties--Morgan and Vinton--the secondary schools are evenly divided between four and six-year schools. Only Monroe County has a majority of its secondary schools organized as four-year schools.

TABLE 13. THE DISTRIBUTION OF FIRST GRADE SECONDARY SCHOOLS, BY ENROLLMENT[a] FOR 1947.

	1-50		51-100		101-200		Over 200	
COUNTIES	Four-Year	Six-Year	Four-Year	Six-Year	Four-Year	Six-Year	Four-Year	Six-Year
Adams				1		4		3
Allen				1		2		4
Ashland	1			3		4		
Ashtabula	2		4	4	1	3		2
Athens			1		1	8		
Auglaize						5		1
Belmont			3	1		2	1	2
Brown		1		2		6		1
Butler				2		3		6
Carroll	1			1		3		1
Champaign			1	5		4		
Clark		1	1	1	3	3		1
Clermont				1	1	2		5
Clinton		1		4		5		1
Columbiana					1	2		
Coshocton						7		1
Crawford				7		3		
Cuyahoga						2		8
Darke	1		2		1	4		2
Defiance				3		4		

[a]Data obtained from Principals' Report to the State Department of Education for the School Year 1946-1947.

TABLE 13. THE DISTRIBUTION OF FIRST GRADE SECONDARY SCHOOLS, BY ENROLLMENT[a] FOR 1947.

	1-50		51-100		101-200		Over 200	
COUNTIES	Four-Year	Six-Year	Four-Year	Six-Year	Four-Year	Six-Year	Four-Year	Six-Year
Delaware	1		3	4		4		
Erie		1				3		3
Fairfield				3		5		3
Fayette				2		2		
Franklin					2	2	1	5
Fulton				1		5	1	2
Gallia		1	1			4		1
Geauga	1		1	4		5		1
Greene				1		5		2
Guernsey			2	2	1	4		
Hamilton					1	1	4	5
Hancock						8		1
Hardin			1	1		6		
Harrison				2		4		
Henry						5		3
Highland	2			2		2		1
Hocking	2			1		4		
Holmes				5		3		
Huron				2	1	3		1
Jackson	1			1		1		1
Jefferson						3		9
Knox	1			1		3		2
Lake						1	2	3
Lawrence					1	7		3
Licking			1	1		7		4
Logan		1		4		8		
Lorain	2		3	4		4		3
Lucas						2	2	3
Madison		2	1	2		5		
Mahoning				2		2	1	7

TABLE 13. THE DISTRIBUTION OF FIRST GRADE SECONDARY SCHOOLS, BY ENROLLMENT[a] FOR 1947.

	1-50		51-100		101-200		Over 200	
COUNTIES	Four-Year	Six-Year	Four-Year	Six-Year	Four-Year	Six-Year	Four-Year	Six-Year
Marion	1	1		4		6		
Medina				4		9		
Meigs		1		1	1	2		1
Mercer	1				1	2		3
Miami				3		3		2
Monroe	3		6					1
Montgomery						4	3	6
Morgan	1		2	3				
Morrow			1	1	1	3		1
Muskingum	1			3		4	1	3
Noble	1		2	2		2		
Ottawa	1					2	1	1
Paulding				2	1	3	1	
Perry				1		8		
Pickaway			4	5	1	2		
Pike				1		3		2
Portage	1			10	1	7		1
Preble				1		8		3
Putnam			4		1	4		3
Richland			1		2	3	1	2
Ross				2		6		2
Sandusky				2		3		
Scioto						2	1	7
Seneca			1	1		8		
Shelby				2		5		1
Stark					3	4		8
Summit				1		7	4	5
Trumbull		1	1	7		9	1	6
Tuscarawus			1	2		7		1
Union	4	1	1	2		3		1

TABLE 13. THE DISTRIBUTION OF FIRST GRADE SECONDARY SCHOOLS, BY ENROLLMENT[a] FOR 1947.

	1-50		51-100		101-200		Over 200	
COUNTIES	Four-Year	Six-Year	Four-Year	Six-Year	Four-Year	Six-Year	Four-Year	Six-Year
Van Wert	1		1	4	1	2		
Vinton			2	1	1	1		1
Warren			1	1	1	3		1
Washington	1		2	1	1	6		
Wayne	2			2		6	1	2
Williams	2				1	3		1
Wood			2	9	1	8		1
Wyandot		1	1	3		3		
Totals	35	13	58	163	32	355	26	167

Besides the 849 first grade secondary schools, there are twenty other secondary schools in the county systems of Ohio. They include: sixteen junior, two second grade, one third grade, and one third grade secondary schools.

Three of the twenty secondary schools are in Group A. They are the two second grade and one third grade secondary schools.

The sixteen junior secondary schools are included within Group B or C. Six are within Group B, while the other ten secondary schools fall into enrollment Group C.

Only the senior secondary school has an enrollment over 200.

TABLE 14. THE DISTRIBUTION OF JUNIOR, SENIOR, SECOND GRADE, AND THIRD GRADE SECONDARY SCHOOLS, BY ENROLLMENT[a].

COUNTIES	Type	1-50	51-100	101-200	Over 200
Allen	Junior			*	
Ashtabula	Junior			*	
Athens	Junior			*	
Butler	Junior			*	
	Junior			*	
	Junior			*	
Clark	Junior		*		
	Junior			*	
	Junior			*	
Columbiana	Junior		*		
Franklin	Senior				*
	Junior			*	
Hamilton	Junior		*		
Harrison	2nd Grade	*			
Medina	Junior			*	
Monroe	3rd Grade	*			
Montgomery	Junior		*		
Noble	2nd Grade	*			
Portage	Junior		*		
Stark	Junior		*		

[a]Data obtained from the Principals' Reports to the State Department of Education for the School Year 1946-1947.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

The status of county secondary schools in 1947 shows a marked improvement over their status as it was in 1935. During this period, city districts decreased their number only by seven, while the number of exempted village schools increased by twenty-nine. However, the number of county secondary schools showed a decrease of eighty-five schools during this twelve year period.

An increase in enrollment for county secondary schools together with an increase in enrollment per school, resulted in an increase in the average size of enrollment. This increase was from 132 in 1935 to 145 in 1947.

County secondary schools also exhibited a gain in the number of teachers. This was reflected by an increase in the average number of teachers per school; from 5.7 in 1935 to 7.5 teachers in 1947. The increased number of teachers also resulted in lowering the average number of students per teacher from 23.2 in 1935 to 19.4 in 1947.

By 1947, the second and third grade secondary schools had been nearly eliminated. There are only two

second-grade and one third grade schools among the county secondary schools. In 1935 there were forty-eight second grade and twenty-four third grade secondary schools.

Although the median secondary school remained the same distance from the nearest secondary school; the percentage of schools, having the nearest school a shorter distance than the median, has decreased since 1935. The second and third nearest schools followed the same pattern of change as the nearest secondary school.

By 1947 a substantial gain was made in the number of county secondary schools with an enrollment of over one-hundred. Of greater significance was the gain over 1935 of the percentage of county secondary schools with an enrollment of over 100. In 1947, 68.01% of the county secondary schools had enrollments exceeding 100, while in 1935 the percentage was 56.08%.

During the same period, the number and percentage of secondary schools with an enrollment of fifty or less has decreased. In 1935, there were 136 schools, or 14.26% with an enrollment of fifty or less. By 1947, there were fifty-one schools or 5.87% within the same enrollment group.

Another change that occurred in the composition of

Ohio county secondary schools was the great increase in the number of six-year secondary schools. Twenty-eight counties have all their secondary schools organized on this plan. In 1947, there are 698 six-year secondary schools and 151 four-year secondary schools. Twelve years ago in 1935, there were 358 six-year, and 512 four-year secondary schools.

Ohio has always shown an interest in the welfare of its educational system. Since 1890, the growth of secondary schools has been phenomenal. By 1935, they had spread until they could be found in nearly every town and hamlet throughout the state of Ohio. Consequently, many of the secondary schools were small from the standpoint of enrollment.

Studies have been made which have exhibited the small secondary school as inefficient, uneconomical, and incapable of offering the educational opportunities offered by schools of greater enrollment. Consequently, by 1947, one finds that the number of county secondary schools has decreased while the average enrollment per school has increased.

Although an advancement has been made in the elimination of many county secondary schools, there is still room for improvement. There still remain fifty-one

county secondary schools with an enrollment of fifty or less.

The Ohio Legislature has, since 1935, provided a method by which small county secondary schools may be eliminated. However, this action may be halted by any of the affected districts. Therefore, the actual working of the law depends upon the consent of the voters of the affected district.

Probably the most effective way under existing laws, for the elimination of small secondary schools, is to educate the voters of school districts containing small secondary schools to the advantages offered by larger secondary schools. There are many inherent advantages to be obtained from having school district boundaries modified with the consent of the people affected.

In view of the advancement made in the distribution of Ohio county secondary schools during the past twelve years, one can be fairly confident that Ohio will continue to modify the distribution of its county secondary schools until the optimum distribution is obtained.

CHAPTER VII

RECOMMENDATIONS

There are two courses of action which may be taken in order that Ohio can reduce to the optimum number of county secondary schools. First, the improvements that have been made during the past twelve years (1935-1947) may be taken as an indication of a trend which is under way and may bring about an optimum distribution of county secondary schools. Second, control of school building construction can be centered in the State Department of Education in order to promote the best possible distribution.

The adoption of the first course of action would be extremely dangerous. A trend is merely an indication and can never be construed as a movement that will continue until the objective has been accomplished. For Ohio to adopt this course of action would be nothing more than a wager that the trend would continue.

The second proposition would call for an agency to be formed, under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Education, which would control the future construction of school buildings. The stress is laid

upon school buildings because schools do not exist without buildings.

It should be provided that before any school building be constructed or additions made to an existing building, permission would have to be obtained from the State Department of Education. Of course the State Department of Education would have certain obligations to fulfill to those boards of education who ask permission to embark on a building program.

Following are several recommendations for the actions of the State Department of Education in aiding local school districts to determine their building needs.

1. They should determine whether the school district needs any building. If a building exists, it should be determined whether improvements could be made which would allow the building to render further service to the district.

2. They should investigate and determine the financial status of the school district. This would prevent the school district from incurring a financial burden which would become a hardship. The method which would be used for financing the building should be determined. Those investigating the financial status should also be familiar with the cost of construction.

They should decide if prices are inflated to a degree that would make the cost of the new building much more than its normal value.

3. It should be determined if a transportation system could be devised in order to transport the students to nearby schools, making construction unnecessary. The advances made in transportation have not been used to the best degree possible.

4. It should be ascertained whether the population of the school district is growing, diminishing, or stable. It would be a poor policy to construct a new building when there are good indications that the population necessary to sustain the school in the future may not be present.

5. The size of the new building should be determined. This recommendation is closely allied with No. 4. The size of the building should be large enough to allow for a normal increase in the number of students.

6. The structure of the building should be of a type which would lend itself to expansion without creating an architectural monstrasity. A building to which additional construction cannot be added shows a lack of foresight which may prove to be expensive, if the school population outgrows the capacity of the build-

ing.

7. In selecting the site, care should be taken that the surroundings are of the type conducive to education. The site should provide adequate space for playgrounds and athletic fields, and space for expansion of the school building.

8. It is recommended that all school buildings be inspected periodically. The inspection should prevent rapid deterioration and operational practices which shorten the life of the building. Safety regulations should be especially enforeed.

9. The amount of insurance which would give adequate protection should be determined by the State Department of Education.

10. The Department of Education should always have plans ready to aid the federal government, if it should ever again distribute funds for school buildings. During the depression an unprecedented amount of school building construction took place, and was partially financed by the federal government. Undoubtedly, some construction took place which has helped perpetuate many of the small secondary schools. The federal government should adhere to the recommendations of the State Department of Education, before embarking on a

program of school building construction.

To some people, a program of this type transfers too much control from the local school district to the State Department of Education. They reason that the local district should have the privilege of spending their money as they wish.

This attitude may have rested on good grounds before the Traxler-Kieffer-Matthews Foundation Program was initiated. Since the passage of this bill, funds which have been collected by the state are dispensed over the state for public education. To the extent that state money is used to support local education, there is a responsibility on the part of the local school district to the entire state for the way the money is spent.

Further, one must consider that money expended for unnecessary construction could be used to enhance the educational experiences of the students. It is necessary to remember always that education is supported for the good of the students, and the more money devoted to this end, the more efficient our educational program becomes.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BURNS, James J. Educational History of Ohio. Columbus, Ohio: Historical Publishing Company, 1905, 776 pp. Interesting account of education in Ohio from the days of the Northwest Territory to the twentieth century.

GEER, Ralph H. History of Education in Ohio From 1900-1938. Unpublished master's thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1938. 124 pp. Traces the development of education in Ohio from 1900 to 1938 with emphasis on legislative action to improve educational opportunities.

HATTON, Otis C. The Distribution of High Schools in the County Districts of Ohio. Unpublished master's thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1927. 73 pp. Discusses the distribution of county high schools for the school year 1925-1926.

HICKMAN, John A. Recent Changes in the Distribution of High Schools in the County Districts of Ohio. Unpublished master's thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1935. 67 pp. Shows changes in distribution from 1926 to 1935.